

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-33 are pending in this application. Applicant has canceled claims 6, 9, 20, 25, and 28 and has amended claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, and 29-31 to expedite prosecution on the merits. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 11 has been amended to overcome the objection noted by the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number (USPN) 5,410,540 to Aiki et al. (“Aiki”) in view of USPN 6,751,219 to Lipp et al (“Lipp”).

Claims 4-6, 14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiki in view Lipp and further in view of USPN 5,646,886 to Brahmhatt (“Brahmhatt”).

Claims 8, 9, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiki in view of Lipp and Brahmhatt and further in view of USPN 6,574,194 to Sun et al. (“Sun”).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiki in view of Lipp and in further view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0041579 to Medina et al (“Medina”).

Claims 21, 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiki in view of Lipp and in further view of USPN 6,724,761 to Moy-Yee et al ("Moy-Yee"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 23-25 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiki in view of Lipp and Moy-Yee and further in view of Brahmhatt.

Claims 27, 28, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Aiki in view of Lipp and Moy-Yee and further in view of Sun.

Applicant respectfully traverses theses rejection.

According to MPEP § 2143, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See* MPEP 706.02(j). Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, among its other elements, "a first memory comprising multiple segments, each segment comprising multiple independently addressable channels, the first logic circuit configured to determine a number of channels and segments needed to store the number of copies of the input data

frame, the first memory coupled to the first logic circuit and configured to store multiple copies of the input data frame within a single segment of the determined number of segments and to read the multiple copies of the input data frame from the single segment in a single read cycle.”

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite, among its other elements, “a memory coupled to the first logic circuit and configured to store and read the copies of the input data frame, the memory being comprised of segments including independently addressable channels with one or more segments being accessible at a given time, the first logic circuit configured to determine a number of channels and segments needed to store the number of copies of the input data frame, the first memory to store multiple copies of the input data frame within a single segment of the determined number of segments and to read the multiple copies of the input data frame from the single segment in a single read cycle.”

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite, among its other elements, “memory comprising multiple segments, each segment comprising multiple independently addressable channels; a processor coupled to the memory and programmed to determine the number of copies of the input data frame to make and to determine when to read at least one copy of the input data frame from the memory, the processor configured to determine a number of channels and segments needed to store the number of copies of the input data frame, the memory to store multiple copies of the input data frame within a single segment of the determined number of segments and to read the multiple copies of the input data frame from the single segment in a single read cycle.”

Independent claim 29 has been amended to recite, among its other elements, “determine a number of channels and segments needed to store the number of copies of the input data frame; forward instructions and the copies of the received data frame to the memory so as to cause the memory to store multiple copies of the received data frame within a single segment of the determined number of segments; forward instructions to the memory to read out the multiple copies of the received data frame from the single segment in parallel and output the copies onto a bus in a single clock cycle.”

Applicant submits that none of the cited references including Aiki, Lipp, Brahmabhatt, Sun, Medina, and Moy-Yee teaches or suggests the above features as recited in amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 29. As recited above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03. As such, even if the cited references could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 29. Therefore, the cited references, whether alone or in combination, are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 29. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-33 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-33 are non-obvious and represent patentable subject matter in view of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant

submits that the claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-33 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references. Moreover, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29-33 are in allowable form. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC



---

Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: January 30, 2007

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102  
Wexford, PA 15090  
(724) 933-5529